

# CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1801  
(202) 974-1500  
FACSIMILE  
(202) 974-1999  
WWW.CLEARYGOTTLIEB.COM

NEW YORK  
PARIS  
BRUSSELS  
LONDON  
FRANKFURT  
COLOGNE  
MOSCOW

ROME  
MILAN  
HONG KONG  
BEIJING  
BUENOS AIRES  
SÃO PAULO  
ABU DHABI  
SEOUL

MARK LEDDY  
GEORGE S. CARY  
MITCHELL S. COPLER  
GIORGIANI P. PREZIOSO  
MICHAEL J. KRIMMINGER  
MATTHEW D. SLATER  
MICHAEL A. MAZZUCHI  
ROBERT W. COOK  
MARK W. NELSON  
ROBIN M. BERGEN  
DEREK M. BUSH  
BRIAN BYRNIE  
PAUL D. MARQUARDT  
JEREMY CALSYN  
LEAH BRANNON  
KATHERINE MOONEY CARROLL  
PAUL R. ST. LAWRENCE  
RESIDENT PARTNERS

KENNETH L. BACHMAN, JR.  
DANIEL B. SILVER  
RICHARD DE VENDTS  
SARAH E. SCHWARTZ  
WILLIAM B. MCGOURN III  
JOHN S. MAGNEY  
JANET L. WELLER  
LINDA J. SOLDO  
JOHN T. BYAM  
SENIOR COUNSEL

W. RICHARD BIDSTRUP  
STEVEN J. KAISER  
JOYCE E. MCCARTY  
KATHLEEN W. BRADISH  
COUNSEL

KAREN A. KERR  
JOHN P. MCGILL, JR.  
THOMAS L. HALL  
LARRY WORK-DUMBOWSKI  
SENIOR ATTORNEYS

NOWELL BAMBERGER

STEPHEN BOWNE

JACOB M. CHACKIN

ETHAN CRAIG

SARAH CRANDALL

DANIEL CULLEY

MATTHEW A. DAIGLER

LISA M. DANZIG\*

RYAN M. DAVIS

JOANNA MARIA EL KHOURY\*

ELAINE EWING

ERIN FRAKE\*

PATRICK FULLER

SAURAK GHOSH

MELISSA L. GOHLKE\*

JONATHAN ALEXANDER HALL

CARRIE ELIZABETH HANSON\*

JAMES HUNSBERGER\*

MEGHAN A. IRMLER

BRADLEY JUSTUS

ANNA KARASS\*

THOMAS KELLY

ZUZANNA KNYPINSKI

ALBERT LAI

ALEXIS R.B. LAZDA\*

CHINYELU K. LEE\*

MEREDITH LEIGH MANN\*

BENJAMIN A. LEVIN

KATHERINE LEVINE

MACEY LEVINGTON  
JENNIFER X. LUO\*  
CARL L. MALIN  
MATTHEW A. MCQUIRE  
ROBERT J. MCNAMEE\*  
BENJAMIN MEEKS  
DAN MIFFLIN  
KARI E. MILLIGAN  
MORGAN L. MULVENON  
CHRISTINE MUNDIA  
NICHOLAS A. ORTIZ  
ANTONIO M. POZOS  
KENNETH S. REINKER  
HAKEEM RIZK\*  
GREGORY T.W. ROSENBERG\*  
AARON S. ROSS\*  
ALYSSA C. SCRUGGS\*  
OMAR SERAGELDIN  
SAIF SHAH MOHAMMED  
LAUREN E. SNYDER\*  
CAROLINE STANTON  
CHARLES STERLING  
LANYA A. THOMAS  
TARA LYNN TAVERNIA  
TEALE TOWELL  
ASHLEY WALKER  
ERIK WITTMAN  
ASSOCIATES

\* ADMITTED ONLY TO A BAR OTHER THAN THAT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.  
WORKING UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF PRINCIPALS OF THE WASHINGTON OFFICE.

Writer's Direct Dial: +1 (202) 974-1920  
E-Mail: [grary@cgsh.com](mailto:grary@cgsh.com)

September 29, 2014

## VIA ECF

Hon. Vernon S. Broderick, U.S.D.J.  
Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse  
40 Foley Square, Room 415  
New York, NY 10007

Re: *In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Coffee Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 2542;  
Briefing for Keurig's Motions to Dismiss

Dear Judge Broderick:

I write in response to Your Honor's Order (ECF No. 155) issued last Friday evening directing Defendant Keurig Green Mountain ("Keurig") to file four separate briefs in support of its motions to dismiss the four operative complaints in the above-captioned multi-district litigation, which are due on October 6, 2014. Keurig seeks leave under Your Honor's Individual Rule 4.B to file an oversized opening brief of 35 pages in support of its motion to dismiss the complaint of Plaintiffs TreeHouse Foods, Inc., Bay Valley Foods, LLC, and Sturm Foods Inc. (collectively, "TreeHouse").

As Your Honor is aware, TreeHouse's complaint is lengthy (spanning 89 pages and 410 paragraphs, plus an additional 52 pages of exhibits), and enumerates 18 purported claims for relief. These claims include Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, Section 3 of the Clayton Act, and various state law statutory and common law claims based on the launch of Keurig 2.0 brewer, Keurig's distribution agreements, Keurig's licensing agreements, and prior litigation between the parties. TreeHouse itself has emphasized the number and variety of claims at issue. *See TreeHouse Foods, Inc. v. Green Mountain Coffee Roasters, Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-00905-VSB, (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 13, 2014) ECF No. 24 (TreeHouse's response to Keurig's pre-motion letter).

The TreeHouse complaint is the first-filed complaint and has the largest number of claims. Keurig is not seeking leave to file an oversized brief in support of its motions to dismiss the other three complaints.

In large multi-district litigations, courts in this district routinely permit defendants to file briefs in support of a motion to dismiss that exceed 25 pages. *See, e.g.*,

- *In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative, & ERISA Litig.*, No. 1:09-md-02058-PKC (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 24, 2009) ECF No. 65 (Defendant's filed brief in support of its motion to dismiss was 74 pages);
- *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.*, No. 1:13-md-02481-KBF (S.D.N.Y. July 29, 2014) ECF No. 505 (53 pages);
- *In re Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Litig.*, No. 1:13-md-02476-DLC (S.D.N.Y. May 23, 2014) ECF No. 298 (50 pages);
- *In re Foreign Exchange Benchmark Rates Antitrust Litig.*, No. 1:13-cv-07789-LGS (S.D.N.Y. May 30, 2014) ECF No. 209 (40 pages).

Courts in other jurisdictions also regularly permit oversized briefs in antitrust multi-district litigations. *See, e.g.*,

- *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litig. / In Re: Occupant Safety Restraint Sys.*, No. 2:12-md-02311-MOB-MKM (E.D. Mich. Oct. 21, 2013) ECF No. 609 (90 pages);
- *In re On-Line Travel Company (OTC) / Hotel Booking Antitrust Litig.*, No. 3:12-cv-03515-B (N.D. Tex. July 1, 2013) ECF No. 108 (53 pages);
- *In re Refrigerant Compressors Antitrust Litig.*, No. 2:09-md-02042-SFC (E.D. Mich. Aug. 30, 2010) ECF No. 162 (47 pages).

In a number of these actions, the courts granted leave to file one oversized brief even though the defendants were filing multiple briefs, others of which complied with the ordinary page limits.<sup>1</sup> Keurig believes that 35 pages would be the minimum sufficient length for its brief in response to TreeHouse.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ George S. Cary*

George S. Cary

cc: Counsel of record (via ECF)

---

<sup>1</sup> Although a number of these cases involved a single oversized brief in support of a motion to dismiss multiple complaints (e.g., direct and indirect purchaser complaints), in *In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Foreign Exchange Benchmark Rates Antitrust Litigation* and *In re Refrigerant Compressors Antitrust Litigation*, the courts granted leave to file one oversized brief even where defendants were also filing additional briefs targeted at other complaints. In *Compressors*, for example, defendants were given 50 pages to brief the motion to dismiss the indirect purchaser complaint, while the brief supporting the motion to dismiss the direct purchaser complaint was under 25 pages. In the *Foreign Exchange* litigation, defendants were given 40 pages to brief the motion to dismiss the consolidated complaint from the domestic plaintiffs, and 20 pages to brief the motions to dismiss the two separate foreign-purchaser complaints.